



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

PAPERS OF THE AMERICAN SCHOOL OF CLASSICAL
STUDIES AT ATHENS.

A TORSO FROM DAPHNE.

[PLATE XL.]

The torso which by the kindness of the Ephor-General of Antiquities, Mr. Kabbadias, I am allowed to publish in this article, was found in the summer of 1892, in the Pass of Daphne, at the western end, near the temple of Aphrodite, in excavations conducted by Mr. Kabouroglos for the Archæological Society of Athens. It is noticed in the *Deltion* of 1892, p. 49, as κορμὸς νεανίου ἀρχαϊκῆς τέχνης, a designation which is not only inadequate, considering the importance of the object, but incorrect. It cannot properly be called archaic.

The torso is of Parian marble, and is somewhat more than two-thirds life size. The only significant dimension that can be given exactly is the length of the body from the bottom of the neck to the *membrum virile*. This dimension is .36 m. The figure is therefore somewhat smaller than the ephebus from the Acropolis, a cut of which is given in Collignon, *Histoire de la Sculpture Grecque*, p. 374. It coincides more nearly in size with the Ptoïan Apollo published in the *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique* (1886, plate vi), except that the latter has an abnormally long body. Owing to the breaking off of the left leg and the right arm, with some of the body adjacent, it is impossible to give either the breadth of the shoulders or of the hips, or even the girth of our torso. Even the right leg is so broken as to leave no clear traces of the situation of the knee; but the thigh seems to have been longer in proportion to the body than was the case in the Ptoïan Apollo.

There can be little doubt that the figure was meant to represent an ephebus, not so much from its small size as from the general

build. Plate XI represents the figure from two different points of view.

We see at once that we have before us a portrayal of intense exertion. In the absence of head, legs, and arms, it might seem preposterous to try to discover what the action is. When so little is preserved it might seem open to doubt whether the figure was standing upright or lying on its face or its back, or was brought to its knees, or whether it stood singly or facing an antagonist, either victorious or *in extremis*. Neither can we tell what it may have held in hands that are now gone. But, in spite of all this, an approximation to a reasonable interpretation may perhaps be made.

Let us notice more closely the position of our figure. The right leg is advanced very vigorously beyond the right shoulder; but the right arm was thrown back, as is shown by the flatness of the right breast compared with the left, the greater prominence of the ribs on the right side, and the rolling together of the muscles of the back adjacent to this shoulder. But while the left leg, of which we have not even a stump, was thrown far back, as the strained abdomen shows, the left shoulder (and this is the characteristic feature of the position) is thrown so far forward that when we look at it edgewise, taking the upper body *en flanc*, we see the lower body *en face*. The left arm, judging from the remaining stump, must have been extended forward and with a downward inclination directly in front of the *pubes*.

By this contrasted motion of the arms and the legs an antagonism is brought about between the upper and lower halves of the body; and yet, were all the missing limbs present, we should see a controlling symmetry in the whole figure, including a chiasmic responsion of right arm and left leg, as well as of left arm and right leg, which we can *now* partly see.

The furrow running down the middle of the front of the body bends sharply from right to left, while on the back the furrow runs downward from left to right, drawn over to the right side by the forward tension of the right leg. Cf. Brunn, *Monuments de la Sculpture Grecque et Romaine*, No. 249, where the furrow is deeper than in our figure. The head was bent somewhat to the right.

A. Of the intensity of the action there can be no doubt. As to the kind of action, a half-dozen or more possibilities present themselves.

1. The attitude of the Munich athlete pouring oil into his extended left hand (Brunn, *op. cit.*, No. 132) is somewhat parallel. But, as it does not approach this figure in intensity of action, it may be dismissed at once.

2. That it was a sandal-binder, like the Lysippian Hermes in the Acropolis Museum (*Mittheil. arch. Inst., Athen. Abtheil.*, xi, Taf. ix), supposed, before the head was found, to be a charioteer, or like the so-called Jason (Brunn, *op. cit.*, No. 67), is hardly possible. The inclination of the head of our figure to the right is not a significant difference. Some of the replicas of Jason in Clarac, *Musée de Sculpture*, vol. v, plate 814, also have the head turned to the right. But the feet of our figure are clearly out of reach of the hands. However much the right leg were bent at the knee, that foot would be too far away to be brought up within reach even of the left hand, with its favorable slant given by the sloping shoulder. And, as for the left leg, we have seen that this was far in the rear.

3. The attitude of tension might suggest a charioteer, with the right hand, which usually held the goad, brought back at a moment when the application of the goad was not called for, and when the whole strength of the left arm, and more, too, was called into requisition to hold the horses. But it is not likely that the left leg would be thrown so far back when a strong brace was needed to support the left arm. In the Acropolis bronze, representing probably a charioteer (*Jahrbuch d. d. arch. Inst.*, i, 173), we see the left leg, as we should expect, braced to support the left arm, and the right arm also reinforcing the left in reining in the horses. In our figure the right arm was thrown too far back to have been so used.

The left shoulder thrust out over the right leg, with the left leg thrown back, so far from being a bracing attitude, is less so than that on the strength of which Friedrich Hauser (*Jahrbuch d. d. arch. Inst.*, ii, p. 95 ff.) threw out the Tux bronze from the category of charioteers. The whole attitude of our figure is not that of strength exerted backwards, but of strength in onset.

4. The possibility that this is a wrestler must be conceded.

Neither hands nor feet are preserved, and among the numerous *σχήματα* of wrestling, something parallel to this position might be found. But it would seem strange that the right arm should be far in the rear at the moment when a wrestler was making a fierce movement to the right. Moreover, before resorting to the idea of a group, for which we have no warrant, we ought to try to explain the figure by itself. This consideration might also make us pause before resorting to the idea of a boxer or of a warrior in combat.

5. The great objection to accepting the theory that the figure is a boxer, is the contradiction in that case between the left shoulder, which is thrown forward as much as it can be without dislocation, and the arm, which seems to turn downward. But even if we are mistaken as to the direction of the arm, and the left hand is to be thought of as planting a blow, what can the left leg be doing, skulking in the rear at such a critical moment?

6. If we wish to explain the figure as that of a warrior, a natural parallel would be that of the Naples Tyrannicides. Of these two figures (Brunn, *op. cit.*, Nos. 326, 327), Harmodius resembles ours more in the position of the legs, while Aristogiton resembles it more in the position of the arms, though neither has the intensity of action here shown. But these illustrate the fact that a man does not attack criss-cross, but throws a whole side into the onset. The Borghese Warrior (Brunn, *op. cit.*, No. 75) has his legs and arms distributed more nearly like our figure, but his left arm is much more raised, and his head turned to the left. Of course it is recognized that he is not in onset, but is watching an antagonist with a view to making an onset. A nearer parallel is found in a figure from the Mausoleum frieze.¹ The parallel would be complete were the left shoulder thrown a little more around to the front, and the right arm more to the rear. A single glance reminds us that the figure in the frieze is running rather than fighting. The warrior from Delos in the Central Museum at Athens (Brunn, *op. cit.*, No. 9) might claim a comparison, but he is altogether too much bent over toward the right knee, and the left leg is not nearly far enough to the rear.

¹ OVERBECK, *Geschichte der griechischen Plastik*, 4th Ed., Vol. II, plate opposite page 107; 2nd group of 1st series.

7. Perhaps the first thought of nearly everyone on first looking at our figure would be that we have here a discobolus, largely perhaps because we have come to take Myron's discobolus as the natural example of strained effort. A more careful look will easily convince us that we have not *Myron's* discobolus before us, if we take, as we well may, the Massimi discobolus (Brunn, *op. cit.*, No. 256) as a copy of Myron's famous bronze. The arms and head afford an exact parallel, but the body is bent forward and the left leg not carried so far back. Of course a discobolus may assume a variety of attitudes. We have one indeed in the form of a herm, exhibiting thus a very stable equilibrium for Myron's most delicate balance (Brunn, *op. cit.*, No. 329). No other discobolus would be likely to afford so near a parallel to our figure as the Massimi copy. The quiet discobolus of the Vatican (Brunn, *op. cit.*, No. 131) is no more a case in point than an unpublished bronze from the Acropolis, holding the discus in both hands above his head, or a similar one in the British Museum given in Murray, *History of Greek Sculpture*,² Vol. I, p. 234.

In one way only could we conceive of our figure as a discobolus, viz., as in the act of launching the discus with his left hand. There is in a vase-painting published in the *Archäologische Zeitung* for 1878, pl. XI, a figure throwing the discus with the left hand, but this left-handed thrower stands almost if not quite alone among discoboli.

8. The theory that the figure is a dancer, is one which it may be still more difficult to reject. The Pyrrhic dance especially was one requiring energetic motions. The Naples Faun (Clarac, *Musée de Sculpture*, Vol. IV, pl. 717, No. 1715 A) is in much the same attitude as our figure, but the left arm is too much raised and not enough to the front. The same may be said of the Faun presented in Clarac, Vol. II, pl. 179, No. 170. A small unpublished Acropolis bronze has the legs like our figure and the left hand raised above the head, as for a dance.

9. However possible and even attractive other explanations of the figure may be, the simple and just one seems to be that it is a runner. We see the right leg thrust forward, likewise the left arm thrust forward to balance it, and so far to the front as to give the last possible moment in which this attitude can be maintained.

The left leg and right arm are to the rear, but just ready to take the place of those limbs that have held the front as long as they can. The arms are used in the action for their full value, just as they are in pictures of runners in vase-paintings (Cf., *Monumenti Inst.*, x, pl. 48 m). It is noteworthy that in this, as in most vase-paintings, the arm and the leg of the same side go forward together. We might call the runners "rackers"; so in some early bronzes, as in Carapanos, *Dodona*, pl. xi. This scheme may be explained from a desire to show the body in front and the legs in profile. Most of the runners, however, in *Monumenti Inst.* x, pl. 48 e3, are running naturally like our figure, except that the left leg is the one thrown to the front. Our runner is running at his full speed, and not stooping forward at a goal, as is perhaps the Naples runner in Clarac, v, pl. 863, No. 2196 A, the attitude of which is something like that of the figure in the East pediment of the Ægina temple, stooping forward to pick up the fallen warrior.

Sculptors, who were so much devoted to athletes, could not fail to notice that it was the runner who caught the popular eye. Xenophanes (II, 17, Bergk) says of running:

τό πέρ ἐστι πρότιμον
ῥώμης ὅσσ' ἀνδρῶν ἔργ' ἐν ἀγῶνι πέλει.

It is not strange that we hear especially of the Ladas of Myron, and that the hoplitodromus Epicharinus of Critius and Nesiotes is singled out for attention by Pausanias. In Athens especially did running come to honor, and at the campadodromia of several festivals the ephebi had their separate running matches. We need not be surprised, then, to find an Attic ephebus sculptured as a runner.

It is not strange that attempts have been made to reduce to runners figures that have long passed as something else. Hauser's argument above referred to, maintaining that the Tux bronze represents not a charioteer but a hoplitodromus just drawing up to pass the turning-post, is accepted as convincing by both Overbeck and Collignon in their recent histories of Greek sculpture. With the Tux bronze must go an Acropolis bronze still unpublished, so much like it as to pass for a replica. The attempt of Rayet in *Monuments de l'Art Antique* to make of the Borghese Warrior also a hoplitodromus has not proved equally convincing.

B.—The attempt to assign this figure its place in the history of sculpture is made difficult by the lack of a head. It may happen that a head has a more or less archaic appearance than a body which belongs with it. Archæologists will not forget the case of the Ptoïan Apollo above referred to, the body of which, found a year before the head, seemed so little archaic that there was little thought of dating it back of the middle of the 5th century, whereas the head was so archaic as to make the discoverer, M. Holleaux, almost willing to resort to the doubtful explanation of the statue being a copy of an earlier one, in order to harmonize that archaic head with an inscription declared to be from the middle of the 5th century (see *Bull. de Corr. Hellen.*, XI, p. 285 sq.)

A head might modify judgment in either direction as to the age of this torso, but judging by what we have, and proceeding with caution, if not with diffidence, we may propose a place for it. It is almost certain, when we take into account the subdued technic, the restraint shown in working out the muscles, that we have no late work. The contortions of Laocoon, of the figures in the Pergamon reliefs, or of the votive offerings of Attalus, find no nearer parallel here than do the negligent poses of Praxiteles' figures. The action is the great thing.

The intensity of the strain reminds one of Myron. Myron's devotion to the expression of life through movement seems to confront us here. What Quintilian (II. 13. 10) says of the discobolus, *distortum et elaboratum*, seems applicable. Had we the legs and arms preserved, we should see more of movement; but legs and arms are not the only bearers of movement. The body, the very centre of the physical frame, shares the movement, not as a subsidiary partner, but as the originator of the action. Of Myron's Ladas, the runner, Brunn (*Gesch. der gr. Künstler*, I. p. 150) says: *Der Ausdruck der höchsten Lebendigkeit beruhte also hier hauptsächlich auf dem scharfen Erfassen der Wechselwirkung aller Theile in einem einzigen Moment in welchem die gesammte Lebensthätigkeit wie auf einen Punkt zusammen gedrängt erscheint.* This passage read with our torso before us seems almost like a running commentary on it. Myron delighted in seizing a single moment of activity which in a flash must turn to something else, and we have seen that our statue is in just that position. Nowhere do we get a clearer

illustration of what Pliny (*N. H.* xxxiv. 58) meant when he said that Myron was *in symmetria diligentior* than Polyclitus. It took more care to adjust this strained body than those quiet figures of Polyclitus. How could a figure be more symmetrically adjusted than this?²

To say that this torso is Myronian would be *ein grosses Wort gelassen auszusprechen*, but if restraint in form and utmost daring in position, *de l'audace et encore de l'audace*, is Myronian, we might almost bring the *grosses Wort* over our lips. It is perhaps not too much to say that if the sculptor who made the original of the Massimi discobolus were to make a runner he would make him like this. In fact, from what the ancients say, we should suppose that Ladas looked something like this.

But, besides this general similarity of attitude to Myron's figures, our figure has at least one special feature of style which we may bring to the support of our designation of Myronian. The style in general is certainly not opposed to this designation. Quintilian's *molliora* (*Inst. Orat.* xii. 10.7) applied to Myron does not disclaim for him something of the spare and severe style of his predecessors, the old Attic sculptors. The *pubes* hair is a most important criterion. Pliny (*N. H.* xxxiv. 58) says of Myron: *Capillum quoque et pubem non emendatius fecisse quam rudis antiquitas instituisse*. In default of a head we are directed to the peculiarity of the *pubes* hair. We might hope to find in this some of the old-fashioned style of Myron. We do, in fact, find a most striking peculiarity here, which seems to have appeared in sculpture only at or about the time of Myron. Not to mention the fact that the hair is wrought only in a sketchy manner, its shape arrests attention at once. It may be described as consisting of two parts, a lower part forming a sort of ring about the *membrum virile*, and an upper part in the form of a flat isosceles triangle with its equal sides somewhat concave. This is the description which

² For a commentary on the passage quoted from Pliny, see BRUNN, *Geschichte der Griechischen Künstler*, p. 153; also KÉKULÉ, *Ueber den Kopf des Prazitelischen Hermes*, p. 16: *Ich glaube es soll durch die Worte, wie sie überliefert sind in der That der Preis einer grösseren Schwierigkeit, der Preis eines höheren Aufwandes von Mühe und Fleiss in der Erreichung der Symmetrie den lebhafter bewegten Myronischen Gestalten gegenüber den ruhigeren und einförmigeren des Polyklet zuerkannl werden.*

Hauser (*Jahrbuch d. d. arch. Inst.* II, p. 105) applies word for word to the Naples Tyrannicides, which are generally supposed to be copies of the work of Critius and Nesiotes, and to date from the time immediately following the Persian War. Hauser calls attention to the same peculiarity in the Tux bronze, and on the strength of it claims the figure for a copy of the Epicharinus of Critius and Nesiotes. This Tux bronze has usually been regarded as belonging to the Æginetan School, and this suggests a comparison on the point under discussion with the fallen warrior of the East Ægina pediment (Collignon, *Hist. de la Sculpture Grecque*, plate IV) where, with the exception of a slighter concavity of the sides of the triangle, the coincidence is exact. Graef (*Mittheil. arch. Inst. Athen.*, xv, p. 12) would extend the peculiarity also to the Olympia temple-sculptures, although it is doubtful whether the concavity appears there at all. It is a striking fact that a vase-painting of Euphronius in Hartwig's *Meisterschalen des strengen rothfigurigen Styls* shows the same peculiarity of form. This vase, for the exactness of the reproduction of which in this particular Hartwig vouches verbally, may be dated at about 470 B. C. Plates LXII 2 and LXIII 2 of the same work show exactly the same peculiarity. Less perfect examples may also be seen in plates XXVI, XLVII and XLIX. All these examples seem to put this peculiarity into a period of some fifty years, with the Persian War about in the middle, and in the latter part of which Myron would fall.

There is then no rashness in finding for our figure or its original a date as far back as that of Myron. The question whether our figure is a copy or an original work is one that forces itself next upon our consideration. If it is a copy, it is still of great value as material for the history of sculpture, allowing us to picture to ourselves how one of Myron's runners looked. But it is perhaps an original work of Myron. Although he seems in general to have shunned marble, our record is far too incomplete to allow us to reject the possibility of his having wrought the figure himself. The general impression which one receives at first glance, and which is deepened by repeated contemplation, is that it is not the hand of a copyist that we see here, but that of a master.

Possibly it may be difficult, when we descend to details, to make an array of items strong enough to convert this impression

into a conviction. Still it is well to call attention to the combination of a general hardness of manner with a softness of modelling in the breast, a combination which a copyist would have been likely to miss. The figure also shows nowhere a plane surface, the nearest approach to it being at the right breast. To prevent this wooden appearance the hip has a gentle hollowing out, as has also the thigh on the inside.

The abdomen consists of three perpendicular hollows and two ridges. The back, which is a masterpiece of modelling, has also three hollows with corresponding ridges. There is a deep hollow under the left shoulder. The line of demarcation between the hips and the body is almost lacking. We see here none of that appearance of the fat of the body falling down over the hips which appears in many statues. There is a double swell of muscle extending across the body above the navel, and a single one below it. The triangle of the *pubes* is echoed by a slight triangle enclosing the navel. The furrow down the middle of the breast is interrupted by one considerable swell and another almost imperceptible one above and below it. One hardly knows where to bestow the most praise—on the back, the chest, the abdomen, or the remaining thigh. It is the master's hand alone that gives all the details in perfection. There is plenty of room for this figure in the list of Myron's works given in Pliny (*N. H.* xxxiv. 57), under the phrase *Delphicos pentathlos*. It would also not be unnatural that a work of Myron's art should be found along the Sacred Way, the main thoroughfare overland from Athens not only to Eleusis but also to Delphi and all the world besides.

RUFUS B. RICHARDSON.

American School of Classical Studies at Athens,
January, 1894.



A TORSO FROM DAPHNE.